

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-63. Claims 1, 13, 30, 42, 48, 49 and 52 are amended for clarification and new claim 64 has been added. Thus, claims 1-64 remain pending for which reconsideration is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):**

Claims 1-63 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. U.S. Patent 5,991,374 (Hazenfield).

Hazenfield discusses a remotely programmable message delivery system that programs messages and transmits the messages to intended message playback devices in a music on hold system. In Hazenfield, remote sites (18, 20 and 22) are each provided with one or more message playback devices (24a, 24b, 24c and 24d) (see, FIG. 1 and corresponding text). The client computers (14) of Hazenfield are used by clients to enter information relating to the generation of messages at one or more remote sites (see, col. 4, lines 18-29 and col. 5, lines 9-17) and later transmit the message playlists to selected remote sites (18, 20 or 22) (see, col. 5 line 18-40) such that intended recipients of the messages call up and hear the programmed messages selected at the remote sites. For example, a bank controls playback of messages at different regions by selecting messages to be played at the different regions based on needs of the bank. That is, Hazenfield is not interactive with respect a recipient of the messages and is limited to programming the messages via a client software at a remote site and providing the messages to the recipient as dictated by the programming at the remote site.

In contrast, the present invention enables a recipient user to interactively sort and obtain messages in accordance with the recipient user's preference. For example, messages sent to recipient A are enabled to be interactively categorized by recipient A before or during a call such that the messages are presented to recipient A based on the categorization. This provides a recipient of messages to have an interactive role in the presentation of the messages to the recipient.

Independent claim 1 as amended, the present invention enables messages "to be interactively categorized according to the at least two attributes... by a recipient of the plurality of messages". Independent claims 13, 30, 42 and 52 also recite that a corresponding or intended "recipient" categorizes the messages to be presented.

Further, independent claims 48 and 49 recite that the messages are "categorizable by a user identified therein" and "the user is identified as a recipient by the newly-arrived message and/or the set of the messages", respectively.

Hazenfield does not teach or suggest providing an interactive role to "a recipient" of the messages and "a user identified" by the messages as recited, in the independent claims 1, 13, 30, 42, 48, 49 and 52.

It is submitted that the independent claims 1, 13, 30, 42, 48, 49 and 52 are patentable over Hazenfield.

For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from independent claims 1, 13, 30, 42, 48, 49 and 52 are patentably distinguishable over Hazenfield. The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claims 4, 9, 16, 21, 55 and 60 the at least two attributes of the messages comprise "a message sender identity indicator". However, col. 10, lines 25-41 of Hazenfield to which the Examiner points to reject claims 4, 9, 16, 21, 55 and 60 is directed to a paging carrier table (102) that includes fields for storing carrier name, carrier key, input format code, etc, and does not teach or suggest that the attribute of the messages categorized by a recipient user include "a message sender identity indicator".

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIM:**

New claim 64 has been added to recite, "sorting the messages according to multiple attributes thereof, an addressee of the messages having at least partial control over a sort order of the messages" and "providing the sorted messages to the addressee of the messages".

It is respectfully submitted that new claim 64 is patentably distinguishable over the cited reference.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6/7/5

By:   
J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501